Draft Scoring Tool: Muskingum Area Mental Health and Recovery Services Board

Agency Name:

Program Title:

Program Area: Treatment Prevention (circle one)

<u>Section A- Threshold</u>. Proposals that do not receive a yes on at least one of these questions will not receive further consideration.

1	Does this program support the Board in satisfying its stated mission?	Y/N
2	Does this program satisfy a mandate?	Y/N
3	Does this program serve a high priority population?	Y/N

<u>Section B- Prioritization</u>. What tier of service to you perceive as being the primary focus of this program? (enter 1-5 in the box to the right)

<u>Section C- Performance</u>. On a scale of 1-5, five being the best, rate the proposal regarding each of the questions below.

	Question for the Reviewer	Score 1-5	Weighted final Score
1	This proposal was written clearly, it is complete and easy to understand		0
2	This program concentrates on high priority areas as defined in the RFP document		0
3	This program offers servces that are essential to high priority areas		0
4	This program is able to demonstrate positive outcomes for the individuals whom it serves		0
5	This program successfully promotes the development of natural supports and supports continuous engagement in the recovery process		0
6	This program provides services that are not sufficiently replicated elsewhere to satisfy a demonstrated high priority need		0
7	This program satisfies expectations for cultural competency, trauma informed care, and integration of recovery principles including the peer provision of services		0
8	Describe how the program demonstrably improves the individual ability to achieve progress according to relevant metrics (NOMs, HEDIS, KPI's etc.) that you use.		0
9	This program employs evidence based practices		0
10	This program efficiently leverages resources from multiple funding sources		0
11	This program successfully collaborates with other programs to satisfy high priority services		0
12	This program works across jurisdictions to meet the needs of individuals across the catchment area		0
13	This program is fiscally sound and its budget projections appear to be accurate		0
14	This program is working to expand access to services by individuals in need		0
15	This agency has a positive track record of fiscal stewardship and tranparency		0
16	This program has a positive track record of the effective and efficient provision of services		0
17	The agency operating this program is fiscally stable		?
	Weighted Average	.--------->	0

<u>Section D- Comparative Evaluation</u>. How does this program score on a scale of 1-5, five being the best, compared to proposals for similar programs, considering both efficiency (cost per priority individual served and cost per outcome) and likelihood of success? (enter 1-5 in the box to the right)

<u>Section E- Comments.</u>

	Note- This scoring tool is one tool utilized to evaluate proposals and is used to give the decision makers a common point of reference for making funding decisions. It is meant to be a conversation starter and not an absolute means for determining funding.				